



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,448	09/01/2004	Stephan Huffer	257552US0PCT	3396
22850	7590	09/04/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER NGUYEN, KHANH TUAN	
			ART UNIT 1751	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/505,448	HUFFER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh T. Nguyen	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,6-11,15 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-5,12-14,16-18 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,6-11,15 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 15 and 19 are currently pending with non-elected claims 3-5, 12-14, 16-18 and 20 are withdrawn from further consideration in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of invention of Group I (polyampholyte) and the species A compound of formula XVa (Hydroxylamine) in the reply filed on 07/03/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a technical relationship of Groups I-IV involves the same features. This is not found persuasive because the invention of Groups I-IV do not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and 13.2 because they lack the same corresponding technical feature. For example, Applicant discloses four different types of polyelectrolyte (Group I-IV) and three different types of hydroxylamine and hydrazine species (Species A-C) in various combinations for production of leather. In short, Applicant discloses 64 different technical combinations for production of leather. Because these inventions are technically independent or technically distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Applicant's Priority Documents earliest filed on 03/15/2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 05/27/2004 has been regarded by Examiner and made of record in the application file.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

Art Unit: 1751

- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading difficult.

New application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 10 recites "A process for producing leather, comprising subjecting the semifinished product or intermediate of claim 9 to a tanning process". For clarification Applicant is suggested to re-write claim 10 to read "A process for producing leather by subjecting the semifinished product or intermediate of claim 9 to a tanning process". Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the prior art claims.

Art Unit: 1751

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 6-9 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7-9 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/529,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions are directed toward a process for production of leather comprising of overlapping range of one or more polyelectrolyte and one or more hydroxylamine compound or one or more protonated or unprotonated hydrazine compound during or before liming, bating or pickling stage.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1751

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over May et al. (U.S Pat. 4,443,221 hereinafter "May") or El A'mma et al. (U.S Pat. 6,663,676 hereinafter "El A'mma").

May teaches a process for preparing of leather in one or more steps such as deliming, bating, pickling and degreasing (Abstract). May further teaches a polyelectrolyte additive such as polyacrylic acid salt or polymethacrylci acid salt may be added to the leather treatment steps at a concentration of 0.01 to 0.2 wt. % base on the total weight of the floating or bath (Col. 2, lines 20-45 and Col. 2, lines 67 to Col. 3, lines 19).

Similarly, El A'mma teaches a method of treating leather by adding a at least 0.1 wt. % of a hygroscopic material (i.e., polyelectrolyte) such as polyacrylic acid directly into an aqueous composition in a vessel at a tannery (Abstract, Col. 4, lines 18-33 and Col. 4, lines 45-50).

The reference specifically or inherently meets each of the claimed limitations.
The reference is anticipatory.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the subject matter would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the patentability of a product by process claim does not depend on its method of production and where the examiner has found a similar product, the burden rests with the applicant to prove that that product is patentably distinct. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289; *In re Pilkington*, 162 USPQ 145. "The lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes the determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not the process that must be established. We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685,688 (CCPA 1972).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1751

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 6-8, 11, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May (U.S Pat. 4,443,221) or El A'mma (U.S Pat. 6,663,676) as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Sohde et al. (U.S Pat. 4,097,234 hereinafter, "Sohde").

Art Unit: 1751

May or El A'mma is relied upon set forth above. With respect to claims 2, 6-8, 11, 15 and 19, Neither May nor El A'mma discloses the leather producing process containing a polyampholyte and hydroxylamine compound XVa.

In the same field of endeavor, Sohde discloses a method for preparing a collagen fiber (i.e. hide skins of an animal) with an aqueous solution comprising of sodium hydroxide, sodium sulfate (Glauber's salt), and a small amount of amine or basic organic compound (Col. 1, lines 5-15). The basic organic compound may be selected from hydrazine, hydroxylamine and the primary and secondary alkyl amines which contains 1 to 5 carbon atoms in each molecule of a normal chain, branched or a ring (Col. 2, lines 54-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the organic hydroxylamine compound of Sohde with the leather treating composition of May or El A'mma, because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and the one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have had substituted such polyelectrolyte as polyampholyte for polyacrylic acid salt or polymethacrylic acid salt, as taught by May or El A'mma, because a simple substitution of a specie within the same polyelectrolyte genus would have yielded predictable results and therefore is an obvious formulation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-8082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


KTN
08/20/2007


Mark Kopec
Primary Examiner